



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

made forthwith in different Parliaments. We venture to hope that precise and acceptable answers will be given, and that refuge will not be taken behind vain formulas of secret diplomacy. It is not with their own affairs and the affairs of their friends that the diplomats have to deal. Their mission is to see that there is good understanding and concord among peoples. At the very least, the peoples ought to be informed of the destiny which is being prepared for them. Secret diplomacy is an institution belonging to an epoch in which people were bought and sold like sheep. This epoch is past.

We take the liberty of recalling to your attention the principles, long since proclaimed, which would make it possible to solve the Balkan conflict without the shedding of blood and to the satisfaction of all:

Relations between the nations are to be regulated by the same principles of right and morality as those which determine the relations between individuals.

No nation has the right to be judge in its own cause.

No nation has the right to declare war against another.

The autonomy of every nation is inviolable.

Nations have the inalienable and imprescriptible right to dispose freely of themselves.

The duty of securing respect for these principles devolves upon the Society of Nations, which has the right to enforce the observance of them upon individual nations which may attempt to violate them. The Society of Nations possesses for this purpose the necessary authority and force.

Unfortunately unavowed rivalries obscure the clear vision of what is the imperative duty of the nations which pretend to be civilized. Each one of them, or a number of them, aspires to a leadership which is unjustifiable and desires to reserve for itself alone the exploitation of certain regions, instead of opening all these quarters of the globe to the activity of all.

To this folly of conquest and domination we oppose a policy of wisdom and good sense.

To make of the European Orient a federation of free peoples devoted to industry and to commerce; to raise Constantinople to the dignity of a world metropolis and a vast center, whither the men of all races of Europe, Asia, and Africa will come and fraternize; to provoke by railroads, constructed with the collaboration of capital from all sections of the world, the awakening of the Asiatic countries which have been asleep for centuries, and to open up between Persia, India, and China a great international highway—such is the great work which is worthy of a humanity truly human, toward which all the forces of governments sincerely desirous of the peace of the world should tend.

To this work of life and co-operation we invite your Government to give its disinterested support.

With assurances of our greatest respect we are, for the International Peace Bureau,

Sincerely yours,

H. LA FONTAINE, *President*.

A. GOBAT, *Director*.

More Soldiers or More Reason?

By Edwin D. Mead.

Discussions of national defense by "chiefs of staff" are usually unedifying and almost always superfluous. They are superfluous because we always know in advance what these gentlemen will say. They are the last people in the world for reasonable republics to listen to for advice about the size of their armies and navies. Men might as well ask their tailor whether they should have a new coat or their architect for his opinion whether a bigger and costlier house is in order. Since time began there was no head of a country's military establishment who did not call for more soldiers and military machinery. The German army today is not big enough to suit "the staff," and the British navy is not big enough to suit the admiralty. Our own army is not big enough to suit Gen. Leonard Wood, its chief of staff. We could mobilize only 105,000 men, and for the war which we shall "probably have in the not distant future" we must have 600,000. Therefore young college men especially should get busy, so that when the war comes they can be the officers.

This was actually preached recently by Gen. Leonard Wood at the Harvard Union to an audience, we read, of 500 Harvard students. It was certainly not so bad as his last public preachment. That was at St. Louis, where he went into his glowing panegyric upon the universal military service in Germany, and wished that we might out-German Germany in this sort of thing. But the Harvard preachment was certainly bad enough, and many serious men cannot fail to ask themselves, as they read the report, whether it is not perilously close to an impropriety for "chiefs of staff" and other such executive agents in the Government's military service to take the platform for discussions of public policy involving military issues. The peril lies in the fact that while these gentlemen are supposedly experts on questions of how to fight, they are as such the last persons in the world to go to for counsel as to whether to fight or to get into the fighting attitude, while the uncritical and superficial crowd is constantly apt to think them experts in the larger question, which is a question of statesmanship. The most foolish thing ever said by Fighting Bob Evans, was at a time when Congress was discussing the naval appropriations, that what the country needed was "fewer statesmen and more battleships." His slur was upon the statesmen; but he is to be thanked, at least, for pointing a good antithesis and reminding us that the two stand in opposition, and that the more we have of one the less we shall have of the other. The question for this republic is at the moment which kind of ship—battleship or statesmanship—it means to make its ship of state.

The worst part of Gen. Leonard Wood's plea before the Harvard students for bigger armaments was the ground upon which he based it. "We are the only nation which stands for definite policies which are almost certain to bring us into conflict with other nations which are expanding. The Monroe Doctrine and our policy of not allowing even commercial coaling stations of other powers in American waters are practically sure to cramp foreign nations at some time" and force us into war with them; hence let us have betimes 600,000 soldiers. Hence, the rational man would surely say,

Overhaul these exceptional and offensive policies of ours, and see if they stand the test of reason and of the world's growing interdependence and coöperation, or whether they belong to the selfish survivals of political policies which we ought long ago to have outgrown. "If you are prepared for war," says the chief of staff, "you will find that the best guard against war." The best guard against war is the policy which does not invite war—which does not foolishly and groundlessly offend other nations, but makes them our friends and assures them that we are their friend. "Turkey is being defeated," he says, "principally because of her lack of preparation." Would he be glad to see her so well "prepared" that she could crush the Balkan States in their struggle for their rights? Turkey is being defeated not because she ought to have more soldiers, but because she misgoverned her provinces of Macedonia and Albania, and these in the crisis became inevitably and properly her enemies and not her friends, a source of weakness and doom instead of defense and strength. This is the thing for the inheritors and spokesmen of the world's outgrown military régime to remember in this modern world, and the business of generals and admirals and the rest of us—and it would be easy and grateful to name some of the generals and admirals who are as conspicuous as anybody else in declaring it—is to devote ourselves not to the organization of bigger armies and navies, but to the organization of the international justice which will make these gradually unnecessary.

"When a nation becomes large and rich and inert," the chieftain continues, "it is certain of annihilation by other powers," and the intimation is that we are inert because we do not raise our force of regulars from 105,000 to 600,000, build up a great reserve force, and turn our colleges into schools for compulsory military drill. The whole argument is an argument that our Canadian brothers on the north, who devote their energies to industry and useful pursuits, are inert, and that our Venezuelan brethren at the south, who so chronically maintain what Colonel Roosevelt calls "the fighting edge," are alert for the truer progress and the uplift of the world. This gospel is a reminder, which is grateful and reassuring, of the benediction upon the republic in its escape from the conjunction of a Rough Rider President and a Rough Rider commander of its armies.

"Our commercial growth," says the chief of staff, "must be accompanied by military growth." The answer to this mischievous and foolish dictum was effectually given in Boston a month ago by the International Congress of Chambers of Commerce, when unanimously and with the greatest enthusiasm manifested during its memorable session it declared that the world's commercial growth must be accompanied by the banishment of militarism, which, with its enormous burdens, is the chief menace to the industry and trade of the modern interdependent family of nations, and that the commercial leaders of the world must work together to put an end to the atrocities of war and organize the nations for the settlement of their differences by international arbitration and international courts. I think that this greatest commercial organization of the world would impatiently brook the tuition in the conditions of commercial growth now proffered it by our American "chief of staff."

General Wood could not have brought his anachronistic preachment to a poorer place than Harvard University. "I am sorry," he said, "that there is no military instruction here at Harvard College," and he held up for emulation to the young men gathered in the Harvard Union the "many colleges which have compulsory military drill," and are thus fitting themselves for leadership in the supposedly inevitable war to which our offensive policies are calculated to bring us with the foreign nations "cramped" by them. It is the glory of Harvard University that it has contributed more leaders than any other higher institution of learning not only in America, but in the world, to the commanding movement to put a period to "inevitable" wars, and to supplant the war system by the system of international law and reason. It was a great Harvard scholar, Charles Sumner, who said that the greatest service the Springfield arsenal ever rendered this country was in inspiring the lofty verse of Longfellow, a great Harvard professor, upon the impeachment of our civilization presented by the fact that, two millenniums after Christ, we still maintain such arsenals for the storage and manufacture of our chief tools for settling international disputes. To Harvard University, when he died, Charles Sumner left provision for an annual prize for the best dissertation by any Harvard student on the methods by which war can be permanently superseded, the first provision of its kind in human history. William Ladd, Channing, Emerson, Parker, Lowell, Phillips Brooks, Edward Everett Hale, Joseph Choate, and a score of other great names, illustrate Harvard's preëminent service in the true method of settling international differences. To ask the young men of Harvard to join in an effort to increase the machinery for settling international disputes by force when the whole logic of the hour prescribes a decrease of the machinery for their settlement by force commensurate with the growing and already so great increase of the machinery for their settlement by law is an affront indeed. When at last the schools and universities of the world are rising to the high plane of the gospel which for two generations Harvard's leaders have so illustriously taught, she is not herself likely to pay much heed to the efforts of a Rough Rider to start a panic over the chance of a hostile power landing 50,000 troops on the Massachusetts coast and his exhortation that Harvard should start "compulsory military drill."

The International Boycott a Dangerous Weapon.

Remarks at the Geneva Peace Congress.

By James L. Tryon, Ph. D.

I regret to differ with the distinguished writer* who has made the report that is now under discussion, but I must take exceptions both to his statement of fact as to the meaning of the resolution that he has laid before us and as to the principle that he has asked us to approve.

The resolution distinctly embodies the idea of the boycott, and everybody who votes for it will approve it in principle. It is a proposition that I cannot endorse. I feel sure that it will not meet with the general ap-

* Mr. Leon Bollack.